



Avalanche

Anarchist correspondence

September 2016 ————— issue 8



english
VERSION

Uruguay
Anarquía
periodicoanarquia.wordpress.com

Chile
Contra toda autoridad
contratodaautoridad.wordpress.com
El Sol Ácrata (Antofagasta)
periodicoelsolacrata.wordpress.com
Sin Banderas Ni Fronteras (Santiago)
sinbanderas.nifronteras@riseup.net

Argentine
Exquisita Rebeldía (Buenos Aires)
exquisitarebeldia@riseup.net
Abrazando el Caos
publicacion-abrazandoelcaos@riseup.net
Rebelion (Buenos Aires)
publicacionrebelion@riseup.net

Mexico
Negación
negacion_revista@riseup.net

Italy
Finimondo
finimondo.org
Tairsia (Salento)
tairsia@gmail.com
Stramonio (Milano)
malacoda@distruzione.org
Brecce (Lecce)
peggio2008@yahoo.it

Spain
Infierno
revista_infierno@yahoo.com

France
Lucioles (Paris)
lucioles.noblogs.org
Séditions (Besançon)
seditions.noblogs.org
Paris Sous Tension (Paris et au-delà)
parisoustension.noblogs.org
La Bourrasque (depuis Clermont et ses abords)
labourrasque.noblogs.org
Du pain sur la planche (Marseille)
dupainsurlaplanche.noblogs.org
Subversions
subversions@riseup.net

Belgium
La Cavale (Bruxelles)
lacavale.be
Salto
salto.noblogs.org

The Netherlands
Roofdruk
roofdruk@riseup.net

Germany
Attacke! (Norden)
attacke@riseup.net
Fernweh (München)
fernweh.noblogs.org
Chronik
chronik.blackblogs.org

Switzerland
Dissonanz (Zürich)
dissonanz-a@riseup.net

Sweden
Upprorsbladet (Stockholm)
upprorsbladet@riseup.net

UK
Rabble (London)
rabble.org.uk

Canada
Wreck (Vancouver)
wreckpublication.wordpress.com
Montréal Contre-Information
mtlcounter-info.org

USA
Rififi (Bloomington)
rififibloomington.wordpress.com
Trebitch Times (St Louis)
trebitchtimes.noblogs.org
PugetSoundAnarchists (Pacific Northwest)
pugetsoundanarchists.org
Wildfire
wildfire.noblogs.org

+

Contrainfo
contrainfo.espiv.net
Tabula Rasa
atabularasa.org
Act for freedom now
actforfree.nostate.net
Voz como arma
vozcomoarma.noblogs.org
Publicacion Refractario
publicacionrefractario.wordpress.com
Brèves du désordre
cettesemaine.info/breves
Le Chat Noir Emeutier
lechatnoiremeutier.noblogs.org

More than two years have passed since the project of Avalanche was launched. It was a bet on creating an international instrument of correspondence between anarchists scattered throughout the fields of conflict, a space where experiences of struggle could find a way of crossing borders. Many borders, not only those created by the State. Avalanche has traveled in backpacks, was spread from hand to hand, jumped from one region to another, contributing to an international, informal anarchist space of exchange and discussion. And as always, it is from this informal magma that new projects could see the light, that coordinations between struggle could be tried out, always sticking to its grounds of an autonomous and informal anarchist movement tending towards immediate attack, permanent conflictuality towards all exponents of authority and self-organization of the struggle. In that sense, any attempt to quantify, to measure this informality is futile and can only interest the recruiters of future parties.

Many things could be said concerning the lacks and failures of this general perspective; many things could be said on the errors and gaps in the project of Avalanche. After discussions between comrades who in one way or another participated in Avalanche, the bet of the project stays on. Through some changes we will describe further on in this letter, we want to approach more closely the goals that we set ourselves on the beginning of this journey.

First of all, the editing of Avalanche will be reorganized. In the spirit of creating a real border crossing instrument of correspondence, the issues of Avalanche will be edited alternately by several groups of comrades. They will take care of sending out the calls for contributions, editing the texts, writing an editorial and so on.

The publishing regularity, which has not been there over the last two years with Avalanche coming out when an issue was ready and when the contributions of comrades arrived, will be brought to one issue every three months. The publishing dates will be fixed and announced in advance.

On the level of content, we want to make the radical choice for how Avalanche was imagined at the start: an instrument of correspondence. This means that Avalanche will consist of:

- texts written for Avalanche (reflections on struggle experiences, critical approach of old and new projects, correspondence on the general social situation, reflections on upcoming conflicts, proposals with an international scope,...)
- texts submitted by comrades to Avalanche (these texts might already have been published in anarchist publications or so), but accompanied by an introduction (long or small) as to insert the text into the correspondence project
- interviews realized by comrades participating in Avalanche (a way of communicating that could correspond at times more to the necessities and possibilities than other ways)
- texts or communiques concerning repression and imprisonment of comrades (a selection, which will never be complete and will be in each issue the choice of the editing group), which were obviously already published elsewhere
- correspondence, comment and debate on problems, struggles, reflections raised in previous issues of Avalanche (letters contributing to a certain analysis, a different approach to a struggle situation, a critique on some analysis made,...). The responsibility for publishing or not publishing a submitted comment will be taken by the editing group.

To be clear, these choices implicate that no longer texts will be published that were not written for or submitted to Avalanche, that comrades who want an already published text to be published in the issue of Avalanche should take care of writing an introduction to their text.

The next issue will be published in December 2016. The deadline for contributions to be sent is the 1st of December 2016. Contributions can be send to correspondance@riseup.net



Editorial

September 2016

Somewhat disorientated, we find ourselves facing an ambiguous and contradictory situation. When one tries to observe the world surrounding us, to analyse the evolution of the relations of exploitation and domination in the current times, one cannot but acknowledge that many “certainties” are being turned upside down. The social State, for decades the favourite model of capital to continue to generate profit and assuring at the same time relative social peace, is in full disintegration. Migration movements have taken on such dimensions that in less than a year, in certain European countries, a whole new layer of proletarians, or more precisely, excluded, has been added to the population. War, which was always present as domination is always waging war against the excluded and oppressed, came to affirm itself in a more brutal way: jihadist hits in the European metropolis, a swift militarisation of the streets of the capitals, a repressive reinforcement that won't take a step back any more. And while everybody is called upon to take part in one way or another, the restructuring is going through phases of instability and vulnerability, the bets are taking on other dimensions.

At the same time, while the conditions of the clash are modifying, certain horizons have moved an inch. The big march forward of technological development of domination seems hardly to experience any difficulties. The programs for construction and restructuring of the unmissable infrastructures for production, consumption, control, war and alienation : new high tension lines, extension of the high speed train network and air transport, dissemination on the territory of structures, relays, antennas ever more powerful to allow the continuous flow of data and communication, exploitation of new energetic resources through fracking, the building of new pipelines for gas and petrol, of new nuclear power plants, of wind parks, of solar panel parks, of hydro-electrical dams,... And on the other hand, capital is pushing the limits of exploitation further, overcoming old contradictions and creating new ones. The research programs for nanotechnology for example are intervening on the level of the singular atom as to manipulate materials, in the biotech-

nology laboratories the synthetic biology is completely changing the common perception of the organic and the living, ever more faster computers are allowing research programs which need enormous capacities for calculation (and of which the results will become fearsome tools for the perpetuation of order) on genetics, DNA, the mapping of the human brain, the real world dimension analysis (through the data generated by information and communication technologies) of human behaviour.

Facing this contradictory and ambiguous situation, between modification and continuity, disorientation is not only hitting the exploited and the excluded (sinking away in confusion, loosing any point of reference that is not created by domination, adhering to apocalyptic religious sectarianisms), it is also hitting the anarchists. In the unleashed storm, with lightning striking and the sea is becoming wild (and where the continuity is, precisely, the sea of domination), what could be our compass to continue to navigate, that is to say, to stay on the offensive, to take the initiative? The experiences of the past? The history books about the great struggles of the worker's movement and its anarchist component? The sometimes astonishing adventures of the autonomous groups of thirty years ago, acting in a context of restructuring totally different that the one of today? A bit unsatisfying, no? But still, these experiences contain an element which can provide us with the material to build our compass. The anarchist ideas, the identification of all power as the enemy to destroy, always and everywhere, the insurrectional methodology which could be summarised to self-organisation, permanent conflictuality and attack. That's one element, and one should defend it, deepen it, cherish it: staying at daggers drawn with the existent, its defenders and its false critiques like the new leninists of today, the partisans of alliances and political compositions, the tacticians of possibilism and the quantitative logics.

But ideas do not suffice. The will to fight, the courage to confront the horrors of this world, the decision to attack are equally necessary. But also them do not

suffice. Something else is needed, one needs a project, an orientation which brings together all the elements of anarchist acting: ideas, analyses, methodology, will, perspective. This projectuality is our compass. It is not “local”, it is not linked to one single struggle or one single intervention, it is present in all our choices, all our decisions, all our research, all our discussions. But one cannot hope for projectuality to solve all problems which might occur, to foresee all obstacles to deal with, one cannot expect it to give in some sort guarantees. No, projectuality cannot offer us certainty, it is just accompanying us on the road. The certainty to arrive is not part of it.

Many comrades back away from such reflections, or are backing away by asking themselves the wrong questions confronting the necessity for projectuality. Whatever form our projectuality could take on a given moment (a specific struggle, an intervention in social turmoil, an autonomous trajectory of diffuse attack, ...), it should not scare us that these forms cannot contain in themselves the whole complexity of things. Any choice brings us to make experiences, to deepen certain aspects, to learn from failures also, and then start all over again, but with something extra in our backpacks. Yes, at a certain moment, one should also dare to decide, to chose a certain road, a certain path, even when one has the conscience of that path not containing everything. In other words, one should dare also, on a certain moment, to put an end to the quantitative accumulation of analyses, capacities, contacts, ... “Close the books” (not to stop thinking, obviously), to make action possible. That is the moment when quality makes its irruption. Let’s not be afraid of quality. Let’s not ruin her with to much chitchat, with to much mental masturbation: quality is life itself, one has to embrace her, not reject her.

This insurrectional projectuality, is it capable of identifying the enemy? Is it capable of going beyond the façades of domination? Production, work, reproduction, control, war: all depend on the good functioning of what power is defining as “critical infrastructures”: energy,

transport and communication. The domination of tomorrow, the chains of tomorrow, are being forged in the laboratories of nanotechnology, biotechnology, information and communication technology. The insurrectional projectuality can therefore not be limited to articulating itself in only one way, it are the methodology and the perspective which are weaving all interventions together. Here this projectuality takes the form of a specific struggle against the building of a new high tension line or the exploitation of an open air mine, there it expresses itself in the diffusion of sabotage against small technological and energetic structures spread out through the territory, and somewhere else it materialises in the destruction of the laboratories of power.

The second aspect of this projectuality is to be prepared to intervene during eruptions of rage which do not stop from emerging on the border fields which are separating the included and the excluded. To intervene in it, a certain organisational proposal might be necessary, as well towards the anarchists as towards other rebels. The informal organisation, the small groups based on affinity and orientated towards attack, the coordination between them, a certain sharing of knowledge, information and means; and then, this informal organisation might, at moments of social explosion as during specific struggles, become part of a proposal of self-organisation addressed to the exploited. Even if such a proposal could be more potential than effective, its merits is the diffusion of the anarchist methodology, the arming of the excluded to confront their enemies.

Such is the challenge today for all anarchists who share the insurrectional perspective: contribute to clarify this projectuality, to articulate it, to make it alive, to propose it. The alternative consists probably of letting oneself be swept away by the waves of the storm and getting crushed on the rocky shores. The enemy is expecting nothing less.

Anarchists from the surroundings of the Rio Douro and the Senne.



Spring in France

September 2016 - France

The following text is an attempt to draw up a non-exhaustive account of the events that took place from March to June 2016 in France, and more particularly in Paris. Its goal is to contribute to reflecting as to project ourselves (individually and collectively, beyond geographical frontiers) better prepared in the coming times, with a more battle-hardened view to seize the occasions, open up horizons, to be more conscious about certain limits as to try to overcome them. The different considerations in this text have no ambition whatsoever to express or summarize the points of view of other comrades.

As many other European States, the French State is undertaking since some years profound restructuring on the juridical, repressive, military, administrative, political and economical field. The development of new technologies, the exponential enlargement of the field where they are applied, the vastness of the new markets they are opening up, is leading to a new economical model. Companies have to be flexible as well in their decisions as in their adaptations to the changes, in the organisation of the production, in the management (and therefore sacking) of workers. The State – whose primary role is to maintain social peace – is implementing under the cover of “modernisation” or “solution to the crisis” a whole set of legislation reforms. The last one in this series, the law El Khomry, renamed “Loi Travail”, has not been swallowed in indifference as the many other reforms that preceded it these last years. In the turbulent period that started, a period of slowly slowly abandoning a social State that has ever less to offer, facing this new law proposal, the common sense of a major part of the exploited showed them that the modifications in the conditions of exploitation announced in this law are not to be appreciated as a minor evil, but as an *even worse*. A sufficient pretext to go out in the streets to express a rage that has more to do with a weariness towards this society than with a defence of demands.

The quite unconventional turn this “social movement” has taken in comparison to others, has foremost to do

with the fact that the unions weren’t at its initiative, but “jumped on a moving train”, that they didn’t succeed in including or erecting themselves as representatives of the people in struggle, and that the pulse of this movement is not to be taken during the days of massive strikes or the general assemblies of student mobilisations in the universities.

As a text, coming from Italy and meant to give an overview on what was going on in France rightly pointed out: “*it is not about a social movement, united by a same motive and guided by a political class more or less linked or in competition, but about a contemporary explosion of autonomous forces that are sometimes opposed: disappointed citizens, indignant workers, overwhelmed syndicalists, bored students, layabout troublemakers, neighbourhood gangs, subversives of all kinds... all are coming out in the streets in their own way, uniting or separating or ignoring each other, but in any case confronting everywhere the institutional order. Nobody had been waiting for the sovereign assembly of a movement – social, political or popular – endowed with a legitimate reason decrees that the moment had come for direct action.*”

A bursting of disordered, although limited, revolts rather than a sharing of common perspectives.

« état d'urgence on s'en fout, on veut pas d'État du tout »

(the state of emergency we don’t care, we don’t want a State at all)

Beyond what it allows concretely, the state of emergency appeared as an exhortation of the State to obey more than ever its imperatives in the name of the terrorist threat. House searches without the approval of a judge, nightly house raids, individual bans to circulate in neighbourhoods where demonstrations took place after the measures of the state of emergency came into effect. From mid-May on, just before the days of mobilisation, tens of persons were given bans to show up. Then, in June, at each demonstration, hundreds of people received this kind of ban orders. From the first bans to

demonstrate on, the refusal to submit to these measures has been taken on publicly, for example through leaflets, graffiti, a call to organise to concretely support those who received bans and wanted to go to the demonstrations.

This “experimental” measure has been no more respected than the “ordinary” legal supervision banning persons from a certain city or region which many have joyously transgressed. The “diverted” use of the emergency measures supposedly adopted “to confront the terrorist threat” made it clear for many that the state of emergency (as well as all the other measures adopted in this “emergency climate”) are just another legal means in the arsenal of the State to maintain public order, to increase its control over who is threatening or could threaten him. The uninhibited and assumed transgression of these measures has also empirically showed that power grows from docility, from voluntary servitude, from the fact one accepts to obey. The joyous fights with the cops during the demonstrations, the flaming sabotage of demonstration the cops against the hate towards police, the repeated attacks on cop stations, have undermined a bit more the moral imperative to close ranks under the aegis of national unity.

It seems important to mention two anecdotal, but meaningful facts here, which incarnate the multiplicity of motives – partly unfathomable – of the rage of those who went on the streets (motives that, if one has to speak about it then rather do it from the start, were not limited to the working conditions, and even less to the Loi Travail, simply mocked by some). During the wild demonstration on the 9th of April (aperitif at Valls’ place), we have seen two soldiers discovering all of a sudden the hostility towards them when they came out of their barracks, confident in their ability to handle the situation, and were forced to rush back inside. And after some demonstration on the 12th of May, a handful of soldiers preventing access to the Army Museum on the Place des Invalides, won for some minutes the monopoly on the hurling of projectiles while being copiously insulted. This opportunist reactions – sometimes numbers make strength... – provoking a scandal, symbolically blew to smithereens the blackmail the State is imposing to each of its subjects when declaring the state of emergency (and therefore, the omnipresence of military patrols) and that, by means of propaganda, it is trying hard to present as a silent pact accepted by all, because necessary: indeed, who attacks the one to which he voluntary entrusts his protection and of which he accepts the presence?

We, the children of tomorrow, how could we feel at home today? We see with an evil eye all ideals that could lead to feel oneself at home in this moment of fragile, broken transition; and concerning its “realities”, we do not believe that they will last. The ice that is still supporting the people today has become too thin; the winds that are bringing the thaw are blowing;

we ourselves who are homeless form a force that breaks the ice and all other too thin “realities”.

For the first time in a few months, the terrorist threat is not the subject that through big rounds of propaganda introduces itself by force into daily discussion, but it is the “social question” and the negative this society is generating that is on top. This “social question” and the violent and numerous “incidents” (as say the opinion makers) have occupied during several months a big place in opinion, that is to say, in the opinion everybody makes up *from a distance* about the facts presented by journalists, experts and politicians, and which were brightening up the discussions and chatter in daily life. Certainly, opinion sustains passivity, that is its role in current society: to keep everybody passive, keep ideas and acts at a distance. It is nothing surprising then that *even if everybody is affected, many do not care, even if in their cities, not everything has stayed quiet* (1). But as the State governs also through daily opinion, one has to acknowledge a change of climate during several months: on the front news wasn’t any more the terrorist threat and the new anti-terrorist measures, but the wave of protest and revolt taking place in the country. That changes something.

All other considerations set aside, the negative acting during this movement is precious in the sense that it saw discord in a climate of domestication and closing ranks in the minds. These last months, it is not exaggerated to say that the disgusting blackmail of the State “with the terrorists or with us” has somewhat been ousted, in the minds and during discussions, and replaced with another rift that crossed here and there society and allowed to break a bit this ice, polar cold for subversion: “or with the State and its status quo, or for revolt”. These last months, during the moments with friends and on places of sociability (bars, squares, working places...), it was starting from acts of revolt (lived directly, heard of from mouth to ear or known of through divers media) that discussions and debates started, and not from perceivable demands or political proposals carried by the “movement”. This is something not to be underestimated. Surely, all these acts do not show an irreducible antagonism between the world of authority and the one of freedom, but we can note (during the handing out of newspapers in the usual places) that speaking about tension towards freedom or about subverting the current order takes another turn, you are no longer perceived as an extra-terrestrial, it arouses an increased interest amongst some people, or even creates a light sort of complicity instead of the usual denial of its existence. A good start, we could say to sum up.

“Let’s not rearrange work, let’s generalise laziness” “We are or those who make love in the afternoon” “We want retirement at the age of 13” “Work is the best of all police. Down with both”

The refusal of work inspiring the slogans we have seen, has been present all throughout the “movement”, in flagrant contradiction with a part of its components who were showing a will to preserve the status quo, that is to say, the wage system as relation of exploitation, and the labour law in its current form. Nevertheless, such people, primarily the worker and student unions, didn’t “control” the events, nor could they seize the role of representing the people in struggle. This was shown (at least in Paris during the demonstrations) by the emergence of an entity that regrouped people (up to a few thousands) that can be difficultly reduced to the usual categories: the front demonstration [*cortège de tête*, the people marching on the front of the demonstration].

Here some samples of texts, leaflets and posters, anarchist contributions which were circulating during the first part of the “movement” and which tried to also overcome the question of the refusal of work:

“We are against work

Because we are against a system that is based on the exploitation of all.

Because the managers of this world transform all the living into commodity all over the planet.

Because this society has no other choices to offer us than going to work, some crumbles to survive or the imprisonment of the undesirables and the rebels.

Because work is selling your time, your energy, your body and your mind to managers, bosses and machines.

Because capitalism and State pretend to govern all aspects of our lives and dispossesses us ever more of all autonomy and even of our dreams of something completely different.

Because this frantic production system doesn’t leave any outside where you can freely decide on your activities.

Because Daddy State is only guaranteeing rights at the price of our freedom: it is the same one who unleashed its guard dogs on the streets, creates and militarises borders and wages war in the four corners of the world.

Because the restructuring (that they call “crisis”) means hardening of misery, social cannibalism, techniques and technologies of control.

For all these reasons, and many more, we are not only against work but above all against the world that makes work into an impassable pillar and horizon.

If we do not want to rearrange the length of our chains but destroy them, no negotiation or dialogue is possible with whatever power.

Therefore, it is about bringing this struggle across the limits all those who have an interest in asphyxiating it in the existing framework (as the politicians and co-managers of all orders) want to impose on us.”

- A sample of the leaflet *We are against work*

“In this whole story, the labour law is not so much the victorious result of historical workers’ struggles than it is a compromise, concessions granted by the employers, so that, less voraciously but surely, the exploitation of those who only posses their work force continues.

Therefore, unlike the reformists of all sorts, we do not want as horizon to work “all, less or differently”. No. *We refuse to continue to live in a world where choosing your life means to haggle over exploitation in whatever form (CDI, CDD, self-entrepreneurship, civil service,...), administrative policing of social benefits, boredom, prison or death.*

Neither are we calling for whatever messed-up and demagogic union of “the workers” or of “the youth”. There are *many trades and sectors which are to different degrees responsible for domination and exploitation and therefore the result of personal choice*: cops, guards, soldiers, professionals of security, designers of technologies of surveillance and control, often collaborating with academics, architects, advertising agents, all these companies (big ones as well as small subcontractors) which are making money with the hunt for people without papers, with real estate speculation, with imprisonment, all this French know-how of preserving public order, with the arms industry, with the nuclear industry (a source of disgusting pride for patriots), the scum of ticket controllers in public transports and bailiffs, all this bastards of the human resources that thank us politely to say they are sacking us,... Do we want to fight to defend the employment of all these honest workers who are “just doing their job”? Certainly not.”

- Sample of *Protestation bénigne contre une loi de l’exploitation...ou révolte contre le vol de nos vies ?, in Paris Sous Tension issue 6.*

“The different laws power tries to make us swallow aim to alienate us even more and force us to accept the foundation of their rotten society, based on exploitation and war of everyone against everyone: between those who have a job and those who don’t; between the poor without a job and the poor who have no papers, fleeing war and misery, overcoming ultra-secured borders and confronting the guard dogs of the States. All these divisions amongst the exploited which aren’t anything but a reflection of this competitive prison world which power is building day after day, are as much barriers to bring down.”

- From of a poster pasted in Besançon, *Contre ce monde d’esclaves et de misère... Engouffrons-nous dans le chemin de la révolte!*

“If we want to quit the wage system... It is to finally choose to manage freely our energy and our time of living. It is to act in our lives according to our aspirations and our individual and collective needs. Therefore, it is fleeing the work dictated by the aspirations and needs of the bosses, the companies and the market.

We believe work, in factories or behind desks, good or well paid, requiring long our short studies, doesn’t set free. Quite the opposite, it aims more to keep our minds busy and to disinterest us for the ethical questions of our lives in our societies, to coerce us to survival and consumption.”

- Sample of a leaflet handed out by secondary school students in Saint-Nazaire

“We spit on the life-term slavery of CDI [unlimited work contract] as we sit on the daily misery of precarity. What is filling the streets these days is a being fed up with this ever more unbearable world. What is appearing is a refusal of work, a maybe still imprecise but well present conscience that all law is a chain. Here and there, some small jolts in the normality of society are taking place: simmering in which we can see a refusal of daily submission and impotence, a questioning of generalised resignation.”

- From the poster *We have nothing to defend*

“If we ‘loose our temper’, or we ‘overstep the lines’, if we are simply breaking everything, it is not because this law will prevent us from succeeding in this society, it is because the slightest perspective of succeeding goes against everything what makes life worth to be lived: beauty, passion, happiness, freedom – let’s not measure them.”

- From *Ceci n'est pas une insurrection*

“To break with the schemas of this normality means also to break with the schemas of politics, of consensus, of democratic management. To make an effort to make our ideas and acts understandable does not mean to relegate ourselves to impotence, to renounce to action, to arrange things with those who want to ‘manage better’ this system that is structurally based on oppression and domination. The attack against power will never be consensual, not even amongst the exploited and the victims of power. But it is precisely starting from the attack against power, its ideas, its models, its structures and its men, that we want ‘to meet people’, no matter if we are students or workers, unemployed or precarious workers, with or without papers. It is starting from a field of shared hostility against domination, against all domination, that we could maybe one day build something different in a collective way.

- Sample from *Point de vue sur le mouvement contre la loi travail*, in *Tout peut basculer*, March/April 2016

This is how it all started

The birth of this “movement” depended on few things: the determination of the secondary school students who were blocking their schools, the improvising of autonomous demonstrations in the mornings preceding the official demonstrations which were joined by “non-students”, a wild attitude that expresses itself as well in the strong will to continue one’s trajectory despite of the police forces as in the various damage inflicted on capitalist structures which suffer from the first days on (for example during a wild demonstration of about 100 people that kicked off spontaneously after an assembly and which destroyed about thirty shops and offices on its way). A lucidity also, which brings people for example to throw out, at the first demonstration, a presidential candidate of the extreme-left during the last elections, the lucidity of those who know that when a politician speaks about revolt, he’s lying. The unions saw in it the

possibility to strengthen their position towards the government and the representatives of the bosses, when the debates and negotiations about the “*Loi Travail*” were just starting, but their attempt to frame this curious demonstration without watchwords nor flags bumps on refusal: the first fight with the security service [of the unions and parties] who tried to stop demonstrators from going to the front of the demo and hand some demonstrators over to the cops. (That same night, an office of the CGT union had its windows smashed, accompanied by a claim that recalled “what are the unions: the useful friends of the bosses and the cops.”)

We will not retrace here the story of the weeks that followed, but just give some of our observations and questions emerging from different situations.

“Because, as long as the metros are transporting the human cattle, as long as the electrical current is feeding the factories of death and the laboratories of control, as long as money is circulating, as long as the screens continue to spread propaganda, as long as the fibre optics and the antennas are insuring our dependence, as long as the arteries of the city print their rhythm on our bodies and minds, as long as...”

- A sample from the leaflet *Nous sommes contre le travail*

The blockades of petrol refineries and stocks which took place at the end of May (and on a lesser scale, during the days the strikes in the transport sector were effective) is one of the moments during which, in certain zones and simultaneously, not much lacked for everybody to be affected. The moment on which every person is, through the force of things, brought to see or take sides, because daily routine is not continuing any more, is surely an interesting moment to reach. Maybe we can therefore regret that the separation between the first ones who were implicated in these actions and the union organisations (through their delegates) has not been emphasised. For the latter, the stakes were nothing else than reinforcing its position towards the government and avoid letting the situation slip completely out of their hands. But if favouring the emergence of autonomous strikes is not within our grasp, and demands to go on a terrain and in relations that are not ours, the possibility remains to spread other means of action to block and sabotage the production and circulation of different flows (of energy, humans, commodities). Less efficient means, but surely more reproducible. Not with the aim to overturn a position in one’s favour, but to emphasize or prolong the caused disorder. Concerning transport for example, we have seen in different cities that arsons were targeting and spreading against the rail roads, that signalisation or command cables were cut, that rails were cemented...

The socialist party which is currently in power, incarnation of the Left, has not only provoked discontent in the opinion, but also collected hostility in acts. End June, we learned that around hundred of its offices and seats throughout France have been damaged, vandalised, suffered attempted arsons, were “targeted” (which seems

to refer probably to the pasting of posters and stickers or the spray-painting of tags), attacks “disconnected from political motives” as a member of Parliament regrets, plunging these men of power and their militants in a so appreciated embarrassment: “*We are getting echoes from the field that say us that people want to smash our faces in if they would recognize us in the streets or in bars. What are we going to do if this is true? We cannot all go ask for police protection, can we?*” The multiple motives for these acts are obviously unfathomable, but that doesn’t forbids us of advancing some hypotheses. In these times, the governing party is being attacked “by its left wing”, which doesn’t many a big thing for sure, but at least it excludes reactionary and conservative motives for these attacks as happened during the opposition against the Marriage for Everybody in 2013. Some of these attacks are against power as such, without doubts. And the others? Acts of disappointed or disillusioned citizens, fruit of vengeance for a feeling of treason, expressions of rage against those responsible for a life of toil, will to “settle scores” with shady politicians, people who remember the “promises” and the “common sense” that has brought to to participate in the democratic mechanisms, hopes that say “tomorrow, tomorrow it going to change” and which remember each denied morning of joy, each lost moment that are outwearing their bodies... just some hypotheses.

One of the stakes at play in the coming period (with the presidential elections coming up in 9 months...), is to start from a diffuse hostility against a governing party, against certain representatives, to move on towards a refusal of the democratic system in its totality, to nip in the bud the attempts at recuperation and integration of this anger into politics, to widen up the list of those responsible for maintaining this disgusting society, to stir up the pride and the desire for other social relations, to make the heartfelt appeal of Louise Michel resonate: *Power! That's using glass scissors to carve marble! Come on! To dominate is to be a tyrant, to be dominated is to be cowards!*

The huge questions that derive from this are knowing how to turn a situation (even during a limited time or in a limited space) into an ungovernable one, and what could be an “anti-electoral” struggle in the year to come.

*Further, you have to go further
beyond the trees that imprison you
and when you overcame them
try to not stop any more.
Further, always go further
beyond the present that still chains you
and when you will be relieved, then go on the road again.
Further, always, much further, further
than the next day which comes closer, and when you
believe that you arrived,
know to find new roads.*

Week after week, the front demonstration was always more turned towards fighting (with the police, sometimes with security groups, for some with journalists),

breaking (urban furniture, shops and offices, surveillance cameras...) and distinguished itself also with an abundance of diverse and varied tags, showing a certain creativity and often tinged with humour, mocking, provocation and irony. Some examples: “1789, the casseurs take the Bastille”, “If we throw ourselves with the devil in our body on the streets, it is because we refuse to live as dead people”, “We are the birds of the storm to come”, “It’s time to light the molotovs, Appollinaire”, “We have no time to sell it, fuck work”, “Our casseurs are talented”, “Tear the joy from the days that pass”, “Revolt will be convulsive or will not be”, “Here are your overdraft charges” next to a destroyed ATM,... Nevertheless, we are having trouble to imagine (because of the organisation of the police forces, the zones where the demonstrations are taking place, their form etc.) how the demonstrations could go beyond what they are already. Although this is an important question, we will not go into it. However, the question we want to raise is to know why riots during demonstrations (which unfortunately, the science of maintaining public order à la française succeeds in dealing with) do not propagate, only prolong themselves just a little bit in other forms during the hours immediately afterwards, and to find the means to resolve this.

Another constant factor in this “movement” was the will to launch whenever it was possible wild demonstrations, which brought together a real diversity of people. There have been many wild demos in Paris, for example one that kicked off from a gathering in front of a school and that went spontaneously to attack two police stations in the vicinity, others that started from place de la République (a gathering place during many weeks), attacking one evening a police station and smashing up all banks, offices and shops on the way, burning another afternoon a cop car that crossed its path, another time going in front of the seat of the CFDT union (hated by many) to then smash it up another evening (an action that was completed with a nocturnal attack against the seat of the union CGT, which is appreciated ambiguously by many persons in struggle because of the “fighting” aspects it manages to give itself. This attack was claimed by anarchists, an attack preceded and followed by other attacks against offices of the unions). If sometimes it happened that the way taken by the wild demonstration is improvised on the moment, quite often certain people had precise ideas (and with different reasons) to go somewhere. Breaking and burning didn’t encounter hindering opposition during these demonstrations, with the participants acquiring a certain intelligence of the situation, agility and confidence, but the question of where to go, and to do what, should have been deepened. Because amongst the nice aspects of this kind of wild demonstrations, it is certain that during a short time (generally the time that the police needs to control the zone and blocks off the demo) possibilities open up.

But if we want to be free to act outside of wild demonstrations or situations of riots, if we want to emphasize

the conflict or expand it, to belong to ourselves in the action (that is to say, that the link between our ideas and our actions, between what we think and what we do, is kept as tight as possible), we do not only need impulse to act, the means to do it and to organize accordingly, we also need knowledge – which have to be continuously deepened and revisited – about the reality in which we are evolving, that is to say, about the world that surrounds us, and about the concrete possibilities to intervene in it. As one could have felt, the urgency to act is often a break put on this search of knowledge which should be anticipated.

Hitting right now this order of things in a way that is in accordance with anarchist ideas, also requires to adopt a certain view. Organizing with a few to attack “small” objectives everywhere and all the time, that was a proposition that has been made, in acts, and also by the (limited...) spreading of a text that, although written in the ‘80 and coming from the Italian context of that time, retains all its pertinence as it invites to *go from the centre to the periphery*, to attack the “small terminals of a monstrous project of control and repression, of production and enrichment for the bosses of the world” because “from a small and inoffensive stream can spring, with the tributaries, the huge disgusting whirling river. If we cannot build a dam on this river because our forces are insufficient, may we then at least reduce the inflow of water, by cutting out a number of these small tributaries. And yes, that is a thing we can do. Not any repressive control, how dense it might be, could ever ensure each element of the whole productive project. Dissemination throughout the territory is one of the conditions of capitalist production. So then, this can becoming a starting point for a strategy of attack”.

Hundreds of banks have been targeted, in some areas they even stopped repairing the ATM’s or the windows, hundreds of assurance companies, real estate agencies, shops, car dealerships, luxury hotels, bus and tram stations, tribunals and trade schools, food chains, unemployment agencies, temporary work offices, Autolib [electrical cars for rent], all these stuff and more things still. All of this is the most visible part of capitalism, it are the places of death of which we know concretely the enormous harm that these places (and all the infrastructures that can be found everywhere else) cause during our short and unique passage on this planet. In this sense, we were rejoiced that those things were getting attacked – it even reassured us. But if we are asking ourselves what capitalism is, what the conditions of its existence, of its perpetuation are, of its evermore totalitarian and intrusive growth, then we come to the idea that maybe we should also target capitalism there where it is evolving, in its most advanced part, or rather, where it is advancing, because it is also in this conquest that lies its strength and our misfortune. A (maybe risky) example: real estate agencies are being attacked, but today equally formidable new “agents” are coming into play (AirBnB, but also other start-ups) with a “participatory”, “convivial”, “solidarity” aspect that are

justifying private property by creating new possibilities, saying that in the end, anybody can take advantage of the capitalist system. And the urban restructuring, the gentrification of areas isn’t only done by big groups of real estate promoters, investors and builders, but also thanks to many “agents” that prepare the terrain. Work offices and temporary work agencies are targeted, but since some time, many start-ups are developing that aim to replace or complement their roles. Also concerning control and repression: the research on this domain and the elaboration of new means is extremely decentralised. One of the paradoxes of this “movement” is therefore that although its starting point is the announcement of a new law aiming to make the labour market more flexible, few things have happened around this new “world of work”, of which many, many incubators of companies (regrouping hundreds and soon thousands of start-ups) have colonised Paris and who are also the new responsible of exploitation and domination.

The interest of a “cartography” of power, of domination and of exploitation then joins the questionings concerning the possibilities that open up when disorder interferes with the order of the city.

« Paris, debout, soulève toi »
(Paris, stand up, rise up)

The trivialization of the superlative these last months to describe what is really happening (I’m thinking about this new obsession of seeing an insurrection or the destitution (sic) of the government in the first riot or in the first battles with the cops during demonstrations) doesn’t help us at all to think and favour the unleashing of an insurrection, quite on the contrary. If a bit of lucidity makes us say bitterly that seen our feeble capacities, anarchists are not able to launch an insurrection (and which is very probably true in our context), on the other hand concerning the fact of favouring it (or more “modestly”, of favouring what could be a preliminary like a riot, or simply moments during which revolt expresses itself), declining an invitation to concretely reflect on it can only bring us to miss occasions in the coming times. An episode comes to our mind. Some hours after the huge demonstration of the 14th of June, a handful of people coming out of the metro warn another group already warmed up by the afternoon that controls are taking place in the metro. A few minutes later, the controllers were forced to flee under insults and throwing of cans, and even pursued in their retreat. And the vehicle they left alone on the spot was immediately targeted by the accomplice crowd, it got spray painted, damaged and finally put on fire. What would be needed for such elans bringing complicity and revolt together of to happen elsewhere and in a multitude of situations?

If “small actions” are not enough on their own, they have the advantage of not needing big means and thereby keeping the risks of specialisation at a distance. A part from being a personal realisation of what each individual understand by “struggling”, they are also invitations

to acts. That individuals, alone or in a group of friends, after having taken risks during a demonstration are tempted to pursue the struggle on another terrain is not a crazy bet. This shows the importance of multiplying proposals. And then there's still the question of context, because if each person has moments to act, it is also necessary to create favourable situations. That people aside from the demonstration, but who are sympathetic to what is happening, get ready to get out of their seats or leave the bar to act, that also is probable. It is meaningful that during the last wild demonstration on an evening in June, in the heart of the Parisian neighbourhood Belleville, certain groups of persons who saw the demo coming closer and identified the demonstrators as "casseurs" (and there the semantic trap of the State and the journalists snaps,,,) hesitate to join in. And that after the invasion of the neighbourhood by the cops and the spreading of tear gas in the air, small groups of youngsters start to run up and down the streets in the vicinity. There again, we are touching the question of the duration and the extent of disorder. What would happen if it were no longer possible to live by proxy (or relive) the revolt of the "casseurs" when the Internet is no longer offering more riot porn or detailed stories embellished with images, to bore or resource oneself with endless series to find the strength to return toiling the next day? What if it were no longer possible to go back to it. Or when a localised electricity breakdown would give the decisive supplementary élan to get out of your house, to leave your work place or to more easily move through the streets because of the fleeting disorder?

* * *

I'm sure that I'm not wrong when I say that all comrades who will read this text have had at least some echoes of what was happening in France, that a majority amongst them gave a particular attention to it, and that some have asked themselves how they could contribute. Come to France for a particular occasion or do something where they are, two possibilities amongst others for those who decide to join in.

A contribution coming from elsewhere, and that is a question that has to be addressed in many other occasions than the recent events in France, could for example happen through suggestions: we, who find ourselves in another situation, have done this or that for this or

that reason, have you thought about it? From where we are, we think that on this moment, it would be could if this or that would happen, maybe we could help you out with it? Or: if in a certain situation as this one you would have the idea to do this or that, think about us. A contribution that stays in one's context could be: me, from here, I know you are making this struggle, could I act in a way that my action has an incidence on the reality that is surrounding me and at the same time on the struggle you are waging? The burning of an excavator of Eurovia-Vinci in Berlin, of a Axa Assurance van in Athens, the burning of vehicles of a Peugeot-Citroën dealership in Thessaloniki or the burning of the offices of Poste Italiane in Genova in solidarity with the revolted and escapees from the detention centres and with a wink to the French "ni loi ni travail" are some answers in act. Could we imagine other ones? Who does not believe that sharing experiences opens the way for experimentation?

"... breaches are made in the context of this movement. Moments of rupture. All this existed before and will exist afterwards. Let's continue to look for them and try to contribute to them. But let's continue in a way that when this movement will die – and it will certainly die – breaches continue to be made and ruptures continue to show up where nobody expected them. If one day, we manage to link all this together, maybe we would be facing a real possibility for subversion of this unbearable society."

- Ceci n'est pas une insurrection

"Revolution is plurality, is multiplicity, is a noble emulation of different attempts, is a seismic tremor of which the centre is everywhere and which therefore has none, it is the germination of new life directly related to the aspirations and needs of its partisans, it is the convergence of thousands and thousands of activities with the common goal of transforming the economic and social structure of the world."

- L'Adunata dei Refrattari

Note

1. Allusion to a post-68 song, *Chacun de vous est concerné*, of Dominique Grange, later on transformed by De Andrè who wrote the song *La canzone del maggio*.



Reproducibility, propagation of attack against power and some related points

February 2016 - Mexico

“The media image of the ‘terrorist’ works together with the police to defend social peace. The citizen applauds or gets scared, but always remains a citizen, that is to say, a spectator. The ‘armed struggle’ presents itself as the superior form of social confrontation. The one who is militarily more representative – according to the spectacular effect of the actions – therefore constitutes the authentic armed party. The State from his side has every interest to reduce the revolutionary threat to some fighting organisations as to transform subversion into a pitched battle between two armies. What domination fears is generalised and anonymous revolt [...]”

“One thing is that anarchists have weapons, a much different thing is to be an armed group. [...]”

On the 11th of March 2009, a video with the title *19 seconds of social war* was anonymously uploaded to the web. Three anonymous fighters with their faces covered show the easiness and efficiency with which it is possible to attack those who destroy your life. To attack a bank in a few seconds, two hammers, a spray can and determination are enough. Maybe at the moment, the most notable aspect of the video was the acceptance it got on youtube, it was enough to look to the comments to have an idea of this. But actually, the most notable in our opinion, was the wave of sabotage actions that happened in the Mexican capital (and certainly also in other regions) after the spreading of this video. The propagation of sabotage had nothing accidental about it, it was due to the simplicity with which this symbol of domination was attacked and the facility by which certain means could be acquired, this means: reproducibility.

For long time, the majority of sabotage actions which flooded anonymously and informally – or some with claims – Mexico City and other regions of the country shared a characteristic that went beyond any claim. This characteristic was that the attacks were realised with easily reproducible means that are therefore accessible for any comrade, or for anybody who feels the need to attack what is oppressing and exploiting us. Also today,

many attacks are realised in this way, which is strengthening their propagation.

In an insurrectional and informal struggle project that intends to propagate itself on a, let's say, social level, but also amongst comrades, an as necessary as indispensable element is reproducibility. Concretely, reproducibility means that acts of sabotage are realised with means (incendiary devices bombs, explosive weapons or other tools) that can be easily made and used, and that can be easily acquired by anyone. The intention beyond this is that sabotage might be in reach for anyone, that each person might get access to attacking what is oppressing him or her and that one doesn't have to go looking for an already formalised (or sometimes spectacularised) group to learn how to do thing. Reproducibility is about the individual himself or herself finding the means to act, meeting up with comrades in affinity with who he or she shares knowledge, discussing things trough and stepping on to action.

When we speak about informality, we are not only speaking about it as an organisational method of the anarchist struggle, we are also speaking about it as a means by which the individual acquires absolute autonomy and therefore doesn't have to submit to the ideology of a group – groups that are often of authoritarian colours, but go well camouflaged as “libertarian” or “autonomous” and insert themselves in this necessity to pass on to the attack, taking over anarchist projects or individuals to later on submerge them in a logic of submission to a central apparatus. But it is precisely through discussion, thinking and critiques that the individual meets the need to converge with other singular individuals, or with other collectives that themselves are consisting of individuals. Reproducibility also encourages the radicalisation of the individual or collective acts of attack, extending to the maximum the autonomy amongst individuals and collectives, generating, when one desires, an informal coordination in which, outside of the logic of dependency or acceptance, one could also come to share the knowledge of each comrade concerning sabotage.

Some particular realities

Gasoline, glass bottles, burned oil and rags are easily acquired. Also other materials with which one can attack the system and its cops can be easily found. For us, all means that are in accordance with the ends are weapons that can be directed against power. Maybe some are more destructive than others, but no any means gets ideological overrating over another. For example, guns over molotovs, or dynamite over home made incendiary devices. Also, the reproducibility of the attack depends of the particular characteristics of each place. For example, in Bolivia, where black powder and dynamite can be found on any market, on almost any place, these materials are easily acquired and makes that their use during revolts in such places is very common.

In our context, dynamite was much used during the Magonist revolts in the north of the country, because the possibility to acquire it was very easy as the north is a mining region.

Although in current times, the acquiring of explosive materials is usually a bit complicated, we could mention that in the case of the Oaxaca insurrection, home made explosives were widely used in the form of “coyotas”, which are basically party firecrackers with nails attached to it as shrapnel. They were extremely harmful for the cops who were repressing the revolt on the barricades.

Nevertheless, this reality of daily war, of drugs and arms trafficking, this need of the State to keep the country in a permanent war zone, makes the acquiring of short and long guns, grenades or whatever you want possible. In addition, society is used to its use and familiar with its use: in many cases, you learn it from when you are a youngster, be it for defence or for other reasons. So the use of guns to hit power, or their use during a generalized revolt or a conscious insurrection, is very likely. And again, the example of Oaxaca (as well as other revolts that are less known) illustrates clearly what we are saying.

For the moment, we do not want to enter into the discussion on ethics and morals concerning the use of guns or the disarmament of society. We are no pacifists, but neither are we warmongers. Nevertheless, we can affirm that reality has shown us that the society in arms in this lasts years has only massacred itself, something that is obviously in the interest of the State. But as anarchists we go in another direction: we go towards the need to attack power with all means that are in accordance with the ends. The use of guns is in accordance with anarchist ethics. Here we are speaking of revolutionary action, of conscious acts of sabotage and their easy and efficient propagation to destroy power.

For the destruction of the myth of specialization and professionalism: neither spectators nor actors.

With all the rubbish that the system spreads through television, cinema, theatre and fiction books, an image has been created of the saboteur as a professional of vi-

olence. An image of a professional saboteur that, maybe unwillingly, is complemented by the visual propaganda of some guerilla armies or radical urban guerilla groups (leftist, marxist-leninist or also anarchist) in which their members appear with machine guns and other heavy weaponry in an attempt to have an impact in the eyes of the State and of society; or, with their own words, to propagandistic ends. But we can also add to this the image of the “reckless hero” that some comrades create around the figure of comrades who in the past (and the present) took action.

Taking out of the debate the fact that in certain moments anarchists – and any person who is rebelling – need to learn the use of guns (something that in Mexico, as we said in the previous paragraph, is more common than learning how to read) and learn fighting strategies on the countryside or in an urban setting, this type of armed visual propaganda is nothing more than a hindrance to the propagation of attack and sabotage on wide levels, in the social context, outside of our circles and before all, autonomously, for the following two reasons:

- Firstly, because the image of the professional of violence leaves aside all those who want to attack, but are not finding the so-called adequate means to attack the system (whatever the case might be, because the majority of it has to do with spectacularity), and this makes that these individuals desiring to attack stay immobile and spectators.
- Secondly, because the visual propaganda of the professional saboteur generates an abyss between the individual, the organisation and the organisations. The individual feels the need to attack, but believes that in order to do so, he needs to belong to a professional urban guerilla group, to a systematic organism, or that he has to create an organisation that specialises itself in this and leaves aside other aspects of life where intervention is also necessary. When he doesn't find the organisation to back him up, or when he finds himself in the impossibility to use certain means, again there is immobility and spectators, because the individual stay immobile facing the impotence of not being “on the level” of attacking the State.

It is clear that everybody is capable of looking for the means he or she wants, there is no doubt about that, but my comment, apart from being based on experience and of knowledge about other experiences, projects itself specifically in when this type of visual propaganda leaves on the side not only the comrades who in one way or another have access to manuals and other things that older comrades have left them; I am speaking concretely about a comrade that is isolated (whatever that might mean) from the movement, or about a person who is an “ordinary” citizen” but has decided to stop being it and attack, who then find themselves many times in an impossible situation.

But the myth of the specialist or the professional of violence has other bad breaths

Many times, together with the propagation of this type of visual propaganda (more concretely by comrades,

leaving aside the image that the State creates of terrorists), you have also the fact that one believes that the more specialisation the attack requires, and the more the means of attack are specialised, more damage is done to the infrastructures of power (meaning by this persons and things). The practice itself showed that this is not true and that this is many times a projection.

The comrades who in 2011 attacked the Wal-Mart of Buenavista in the central zone of the Federal District, give during an interview for the book "*Que se ilumine la noche*" a clear account on how just some easily acquirable elements and determination were needed to cause mayor damage to the infrastructures of power. A glass bottle, gasoline, condoms as a time delay and pills of ammonia sulphate were enough to cause the total destruction of the Wal-Mart. Another example could be mentioned of the comrades who in Tijuana burned 31 new patrol cars of the municipal police. Some short guns to cover the retreat, a car, some litres of gasoline and determination where enough. We are just mentioning these two examples because of their supposed "spectacularity" and huge damage, leaving aside the hundreds of sabotage actions that are being realised with molotovs or home made devices consisting of plastic bottles, matches, cigarillos and gasoline.

Also, the myth of the professional of violence or of specialization is often supported by another factor: to be or to want to be always at the height of the system.

By always wanting to be at the height of the system and to wage competition with its armies, besides falling in the trap of measuring ourselves with the same stick as the system is measuring us, the attacking group ends up being a mirror image of the armies of the system, even ending up considering the armed act or the guerilla group an end in itself and not a means to attack – giving often more valour to guns and its iconography than to other means of intervention.

When sometimes it has been said that groups end up begin a deformed mirror image of the State itself, one is also speaking about the vainglory and the overestimation given to guns, to rifles, to explosives. These elements, that should just be tools of the revolutionary, end up becoming his identity, loosing his particularity as an individual, delegating his own identity to a false identity supported by a commercial instrument-icon of the system like weapons – instruments that one uses out of necessity, far away from all fetishism towards them. Weapons are a commodity and the best we can do with them is to render them... usefully useless. As anarchists, I believe this strongly, we are against the fetishism of arms and against any organisation (or acronym) that converts itself into something identitarian and that ends up with denying the individual or the individuals. Our only identity is our own individuality, our only identity are we ourselves and this can be seen reflected in our words, thoughts and acts, that flow together as one.

So then, what do we want and what are we proposing?

Concerning the attack against the structures of the State and Capitalism, but above all against Power, we desire a propagation of attack, of sabotage and of the insurrectional perspective. What we are looking for, is the intensification of the social war day after day. That every person who feels the need to attack the State, Capitalism and Power does so, getting, above everything else, out of the idle position of spectator or of the immobility due to a lack of means.

Concerning anarchist organisation, we propose an informal organisational method, that is therefore in constant development and self-criticism, a method based on affinity and not on delegation or systematic agreement. An organisational method built starting from the needs that we experience in our immediate surroundings. An informal method that doesn't place any organisation or acronym above the individual, but where the organisation stays subjected and submitted to constant practice and constant thinking, just as action is. An organisation based on the informal method of struggle that can be capable to propagate itself and be reproduced in qualitative terms.

Concerning the use of guns and explosives (easily acquired in this territory), a struggle consistent with the acratic principles and with informality. An acting that cuts in a slash with the vainglory of guns, that breaks with the fetishism created around the armed sabotage; a consistent struggle that by attacking power destroys the discourse that places the armed act above other acts of sabotage, and a critique on the fetishism of illegality. Through acting, break with the commercial discourse on guns, mirrored by the big vanguards and militant armed organisations who are placing their militants in a game of power, mirrored in every aspect of their organisation. This is what we want to say by seeing oneself through the deforming mirror of power. We are not proposing a structured armedist struggle, but a direct struggle against power in its totality, a struggle that is capable to propagate and to reproduce itself. And if guns are easily acquired, may their use then be consequent and always as means, never as a goal.

The social war is a constant reality, the individual or collective attack is also so, better when this reality propagates even more, disperses, spreads out through the whole territory. And to contribute to this, the means of attack easily reproducible and easily acquired should be the perspective of concrete attack that accompanies our struggles for anarchy.

For an informal, anonymous and autonomous practice of attack against power



Fire to the cities!

Some thoughts on hostility against the profiteers of oppression

September 2016 - Germany

In our common struggles against power, exploitation and oppression it is always necessary to clearly identify the enemies of our ideas of freedom and self-determination. If our struggles are supposed to be social struggles, we have to analyze their terrain permanently, consequently and with a clear eye and try to understand the social dynamics of our contexts.

It is about examining the social framework on lines of conflict and responsibilities to obtain an analysis that makes it possible to put the profiteers of the social situation in the focus of the social struggle. In the context of these endeavors it is required to take distance from the stupid leftist thesis, that there are no responsibilities in these conditions – people make decisions, these decisions lead to a certain type of behavior, and this behavior has direct impact onto the social terrain.

The metropolis always has been a place where the lines of social conflict are visible more clearly. That's because in this environment those share a surrounding, who shouldn't ever meet in the ideal of capitalism – the oppressed and exploited on the one hand, and the rich, the privileged, the profiteers of exploitation on the other. Earlier in time the social order has been built upon the strict division of those who possess and those who don't. The cities were the place, where this clear divisions have become weaker as they grew and grew and for that they often were the showplace of eruptions of anger, that this division provokes.

On these terms, power always had a great interest to channel and govern life in the city as effectively and as predictable as possible. The recent developments in the metropolises have shown clearly, that power uses the urban environment as fields for experiments of control and management by all available means and that it reacts rapidly and remarkably flexibly on changes in the capitalist machinery.

Comrades from Zurich in Switzerland have articulated these tendencies really precisely by publishing the text "against the city of the rich" (also in Avalanche No. 4) - "big business" doesn't take place in the malls and shops in the inner cities anymore, but the metropolises are sensitive points in the networks of power and produc-

tion and therefore shall be reserved for those who profit from these conditions.

Luxury-buildings, office-complexes, expensive districts for entertainment and consume, along with the permanent extension and improvement of the architecture of social control, repression and pacification are forming our living environment these days.

But still, even in this dystopian vision, flaring, angry signs against this hegemony of prosperity are visible at many different places.

The concentration of wealth and property and the offensive ostentation of the privileges the winners of this society possess are a constant provocation to those, who are excluded, left behind and discontented in their position. The pacification and social integration through the democratic theater might seem all-embracing and unattackable at times, but the tension and hostility against the authorities and the circumstances it defends are numerous and visible.

In this tendency it seems accurate to denounce and expose the profiteers of these developments permanently and consequently to spread hostile positions towards them – in the social conflict around us there are visible, attackable enemies to be pointed out.

The improvement of security architecture, that is supposed to protect the wealth, can be sabotaged.

The fact that we need money for survival, can be met with both collective and individual acts of expropriation. Vandalism, gatherings of hostility and visible ideas of attack can be effective threat to the removal of the visible contradictions in public space through displacement and valorization.

If we understand the global network of exploitation as an organism, the metropolises are central junctions of its neural system which is vulnerable to repeated short circuits and interruptions.

In different contexts it became visible, that comrades are experimenting with different forms of intervention in the urban environment, correlating with each other in words and deeds, exploring the rapidly evolving social space and trying to find ways of intervention and attack.

On the 17th of May 2015, the headquarters of the luxury housing company “von Poll” in Frankfurt is being devastated and made unusable for quite some time, while crow’s-feet in the surrounding streets keep cops from intervening.

Some nights later, three offices of the same company in Hamburg are being attacked with stones, paintbombs and butyric acid. The company sets a rewards of 50000 Euro on the attackers.

At the end of March, some angry inhabitants in the “Schanzenviertel”-neighborhood build a barricade, using its cover, wealthy stores are being attacked with bricks and painted with slogans like “against the city of the rich” and “fight gentrification”. The barricade was built in protest against the selling of a collectively owned house to an investor, who is now renovating and then expensively renting the place to whomever can pay. The public outrage of the attacked store owners, who stage themselves as victims of gentrification on their own and as “alternative” actors in the neighborhood showed clearly that from time to time it is valuable, to overcome the respect for the profiteers of gentrification, no matter how admirable they act.

Again and again there are wild demonstrations taking place, vandalizing stores and companies, leaving signs of rage. None is ever caught, because the crowd always disperses in the night before the cops even show up.

On the 23rd of April 2016, cars of the luxury catering company “Frischeparadies” in Hamburg are being torched – ten years after the wealthy supermarket of the company got looted in the context of struggles against social repression.

On the 30th of April 2016, some hooded individuals use the opportunities of an early morning and the fixation of the cops onto the spectacle of the 1st of May for looting a bio supermarket. Leaflets are being left behind, saying:

“The Denn’s Market in Altona got looted and numerous bags of food have been taken. We are against a world, in which people are being divided into winners and losers. Against a world, in which very few are very rich, while others can’t afford to eat. (...)

Expropriation – looting and stealing of the goods or the money, who serve as sanctuaries in this societies order – is a way of attacking these circumstances. It’s not about enrichment or a more just system. It’s about the social revolution. Fuck the city of the rich. Take what you want and steal back your life!”

At the evening of Saturday, the 21st of May, 20-30 hooded persons approach the freshly built luxury complex “Glockenbachsuiten” in Munich and throw a high number of paint bombs to the facade.

At the 29th of May 2016, an angry mob gathers in a well-gentrified street in the Kreuzberg neighborhood, Berlin. Two barricades are being set alight, crow’s-feet put to the side streets and with this as protection, a new built luxury house, an electrical substation, wealthy cars, a hotel and a supermarket are being attacked with fire, paint and stones. An anonymous communique is talking about “paint, bricks and fire against the city of the rich” in solidarity with the ongoing clashes in France.

At the 7th of July 2016, large parts of the Zurich train system is breaking down – cable funnels have been set ablaze on two different spots, causing the railways security systems to collapse, which causes an immediate stop of all traffic on the lines. Numerous hours, the buzzing rumble of the metropolis is forced to rest for a moment. None avows for the attack – every individual longing for a break in the totality of the other-directed daily routine could have done it.

In Basel, a wild demonstration is taking a street full of flashy, anonymous office complexes in the night of the 24th of June, causing damage to the branches of insurances, security companies and political parties. Unfortunately some persons got arrested after this intervention, four of them are still in custody, awaiting trial.

In the Switzerland cities Basel and Zurich, again and again forms of wild, destructive demonstrations and public gatherings are being tried out. A “Reclaim the Streets”-Party in Zurich in December 2014 ended in a large riot, causing major damage in the inner city. Two weeks later, 10000 issues of a pamphlet are being distributed in the city, talking “against the city of the rich”, proposing a struggle against capitalist dominion in the city of Zurich. The publication provokes wide echoes, both of favor and discontent.

At the 12th of August 2016, the company headquarter of the Hamburg based shipowner Folkard Edler is being attacked in one of the most wealthy streets of the city, a Porsche parked in front of the house is being torched. Edler is not only the ugly, rich owner of a shipping company and therefore a responsible protagonist in the global circulation of commodities, he also donated a million euro to the racist, nationalist party “AFD” for its electoral campaign.

The acts described are examples of intervention, independent from each other, but what unites them is the fact, that they happened on terrain, that is in all its facets contrary towards our ideas of freedom and self-determination. Our complicated endeavor is to not let these attacks become isolated, spectacular stagings but to embed them into the social conflictuality, towards a social revolt, that brings us closer to the unknown, but passionately desired freedom.



Taking authority apart

August 2016 - Switzerland

[In July 2016, an incendiary attack took place against an urgency telecommunication tower station belonging to the Zurich Police. As explained in the following article published in the biweekly anarchist newspaper *Dissonanz* issue 34, a repressive situation followed this sabotage with different house searches and one anarchist comrade wanted. Apart from the need to open up a space for solidarity with this wanted comrade and the anarchists from Zurich, this article draws up, according to us, a crucial point for anarchist insurrectional projectuality: the identification of the enemy. The deepening of this aspect, in thought as in action, seems to us of concern for every anarchist who wants to find herself or himself at daggers drawn with the existent and is looking for ways to disorganize the forces of authority and acceptance.]

A month has passed since the attack against the antenna of Zurich-Waidberg, a month of suspicious silence from the side of the media and the authorities. Only last week the first details have started coming to light, and we have learned from the media that the attacked antenna was nothing less than the urgency radio system of the Zurich police, which is supposed to be a back up in case the normal radio system wouldn't function any more. A fire destroyed the cables at the basis of this antenna, causing hundreds of thousands of franks of damage, and putting the antenna out of service "for several days". We also learned that an international warrant has been issued against the comrade the cops are looking for [see *Ding Dong, it's the State* in *Dissonanz*, n°32].

In the light of this new details, the silence that followed this sabotage isn't surprising us, because what has been touched by this attack, is a raw nerve that has embarrassed the whole of the police forces of Zurich, showing their vulnerability. What could have happened if at that moment, for one reason or another, there would have been a break down of the radio system of the cops? Without the use of the radio to communicate, transmit orders and informations, the police of Zurich would probably have been seriously limited in its capacities

to coordinate and react, creating a favourable situation for anyone who has some scores to settle with this society. But let's go a step further. And what if such a sabotage would have taken place during moments of social tension, for example during the riots in Bellevue a few years ago or the ones in the Europa-Allee? When the defenders of order are not able to coordinate, they would have faced serious trouble to retake control of the situation and guarantee a return to normality. These riots, instead of swift riots of some hours, could maybe have had enough oxygen to spread in space and time. Even their characteristics could have transformed into something *different*: by creating a cartography difficultly controllable by the authorities because of their incapacity to coordinate, they could have opened up new spaces of thought. Europa-Allee, and then? What do we want? How do we want to live? Questions that would have got practical and immediate answers on the spot. The problem of gentrification for example is linked to the problem of wealth, of those who have and those who haven't, and without the protection of the police forces, expropriation by those who haven't could have been an answer. The revolt could even have gone beyond the single issue of gentrification, putting into question private property, and therefore one of the roots of the society of authority.

Facing the injustice and the abuse of this society, we feel often impotent. In the end, transforming society is an almost impossible objective, so what can a single person then do about it? Without giving it to much thought, we surrender ourselves to traditions, rituals, collective identities and repetitions of acts simply because it is what has always been done. The quantity of people in the streets, of the provoked damage and of the injured cops become parameters of success or not for a demonstration. We do not want to admit that only measuring the quantitative side isn't anything else than an illusion we create for ourselves in order to keep on repeating the same rituals. The logics of "ten today, hundred tomorrow" prevents us from looking beyond our own nose, to see that something else can be done, that even a small

act can more drastically change a situation than permanent repetitions of recipes “which proved themselves”. We think it is necessary to develop the capacity to look *beyond* all these rituals and convenient habits which are atrophying our capacity of imagination as to find *also other* ways of acting.

The silence that followed this attack has therefore been the fig leaf that tried to cover up a simple truth: the superiority in numbers and weaponry do not count a lot when facing human intelligence and ingenuity. A bunch of cables put on fire *on the right moment and on the right spot* by a singular person has the strength of taking a whole army apart, of transforming a situation that might seem static into something *new, different and unforeseeable*. Now then, if one thinks about the fact that society as a whole can only function thanks to the presence of infrastructures that allow the circulation of flows, informations, electricity, commodities, persons,..., about the

fact that these infrastructures are present *everywhere* in the physical space, a whole world of possibilities *to act and interact* opens up in front of our eyes.

These last months, we have seen how a small fire on the right spot can also paralyse “half of Swiss” [see *Paralysing everything*, in *Dissonanz*, n° 30], how the burned cables of an antenna can also put out of functioning a part of the communication systems of the police: what could have happened if these sabotages would have taken place on particular moments and interacting with other events?

State, economy and authority are not at all abstract and untouchable, it is enough to find weak spots, it is enough to have a little bit of spirit and imagination. For those who know where to look, the king is naked and vulnerable. We wish the comrade who is on the run good luck, wherever he might be.

6 - FRANCE - *Spring in France*

13 - MEXICO - *Reproducibility, propagation of attack against power and some related points*

16 - GERMANY - *Fire to the cities!*

18 - SWITZERLAND - *Taking authority apart*

The next issue will be published in December 2016. The deadline for contributions to be sent is the 1st of December 2016.
Contributions can be send to correspondance@riseup.net

Debate and comments

From the next issue on, a section of Avalanche will be reserved for debates and comments. For sending such texts in for publication, we invite the comrades to take as a starting point issues, problems, perspectives that were raised in texts already published in Avalanche.

The idea of this section is to offer a space for international exchange between anarchists in struggle, deepening of certain aspects, critiques on certain proposals,...